

## MINUTES

Minutes of a meeting of the **REPRESENTATIONAL COMMITTEE** held in the Stable Block Meeting Room, Stone House, Corve Street, Ludlow on **TUESDAY 8<sup>th</sup> FEBRUARY 2011** at **7.00pm**

### **R/73 PRESENT**

Chairman: Councillor Wilcox

Councillors: Callender; Davies; Hunt; McCormack and Smithers

Officers: Communications & Cemetery Officer, Gina Wilding

Also attending: Dyanne Humphreys, Principle Planning Officer, Shropshire Council and Helen Pugh, Housing Enabling & Development Officer (Central)

### **R/74 APOLOGIES**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Aitken.

### **R/75 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

In accordance with the terms of the Local Authorities (Model Code of Conduct) (England) Order 2007 issued under Section 51 of the Local Government Act 2000 Members declared interests as follows: -

#### **Personal Interest:**

Cllr Wilcox            10/05544/FUL            Cllr Wilcox is a governor

#### **Prejudicial Interest**

Cllr Wilcox            10/05470/FUL            Cllr Wilcox is Chair of the Trust

### **R/76 PUBLIC OPEN SESSION (15 minutes)**

There were two members of the public present.

Cllr Mrs Rosanna Taylor-Smith, Shropshire Councillor  
Mill Street, Ludlow

Cllr R Taylor-Smith stated that the Strategic Planning Committee to consider Land behind 9 -10 King Street will be held on 17<sup>th</sup> February, at 2pm in Oscar's, Ludlow Assembly Rooms, Mill Street, Ludlow. There would also be a site visit beforehand.

Mr Nash, Ludlow Civic Society also attended the meeting

**R/77 MINUTES****RESOLVED (unanimous)**

That the minutes of the meeting of the **REPRESENTATIONAL COMMITTEE** held on **11<sup>th</sup> January 2011** were approved and signed as a correct record.

**SMc/JS (unanimous)**

**R/78 PLANNING DECISIONS FROM SHROPSHIRE COUNCIL****RESOLVED (unanimous)**

**JS/PH**

The decisions listed below were **NOTED**:

<b>10/05042/FUL</b>	<b>Decision Grant</b>	<b>10/05134/VAR</b>	<b>Decision Grant</b>
<b>10/04737/FUL</b>	<b>Decision Grant</b>	<b>10/04933/FUL</b>	<b>Decision Grant</b>

**R/79 PLANNING APPLICATION COMMENTS****RESOLVED**

<b>10/05357/LBC</b> <b>SMc / LC 5:1:0</b>	Dyddle Cottage 21 Dinham Ludlow	<b>No objection</b>
--	---------------------------------	---------------------

<b>10/05424/FUL</b> <b>SMc / JW 4:2:0</b>	3 Summerfields Ludlow	<b>No objection</b>
<b>LTC comments:</b>	No objection to the proposal on condition that the extension remains as an residential annex to the main house	

<b>10/05470/FUL</b> <b>JSm/JS 5:1:0</b>	The Directors House Lower Galdeford Ludlow	<b>No objection</b>
--	--	---------------------

<b>10/05544/FUL</b> <b>JS/SMc (unanimous)</b>	Ludlow College Castle Square Ludlow	<b>No objection</b>
--	-------------------------------------	---------------------

<b>11/00097/FUL</b> <b>JS/DD 3:2:1</b>	22 Dinham Ludlow	<b>No objection</b>
<b>LTC comments:</b>	There was no objection to the proposal however, members would prefer the proposed PVC windows to be wooden.	

<b>11/00124/OUT</b> <b>PH/LC (unanimous)</b>	Area to SE Side Of Riddings Road Ludlow	<b>No objection</b>
---	---	---------------------

<b>11/00291/FUL</b> <b>JW/JS (unanimous)</b>	Land Off Pepper Lane Ludlow	<b>Objection</b>
<b>LTC comments:</b>	LTC originally objected to this proposal, and raises the same concerns in objection to the renewal of planning permission:	

1. The traffic problems likely to be caused by vehicles emerging on to Old Street, including limited visibility for drivers emerging; the narrowness of the Pepper Lane, which will only permit one car in one direction at a time and would, in conjunction with

the traffic lights, cause confusion and congestion. For example, gridlock could be caused, if one car is waiting to emerge, but unable to move because lights are on red, and there is a car waiting to turn across the flow of traffic to access Pepper Lane would hold up the traffic until the lights allowed the emerging car to move.

2. The proposed car lift is also a cause for concern. It seems a cumbersome and slow way to access parking, which may present a hazard, for example, if cars are unable to be removed in an emergency such as a fire, due to lack of power.

3. The varying heights of the buildings seem to be out of keeping with the existing street scene.

11/00317/FUL Ludlow Conference Centre, Lower Galdeford, Ludlow **No objection**  
SMc/JS 5:0:1

## **R/80 GRANTS, PLANNING, TRANSPORT, PARKING & PATHS**

### **(a) Consultation – Draft supplementary Planning Document (SPD) on the Type and Affordability of Housing**

#### **RESOLVED SMc/JS (unanimous)**

**(a) Members were in agreement with many points made, and specifically those indicated below:**

#### **1.2**

##### **Shropshire Core Strategic Objective 5:**

“Provide for a mix of good quality, sustainable housing development of the right size, type, tenure and affordability to meet the housing needs and aspirations of all sections of the community, including provision for specialist needs and the elderly.”

Members also thought that the housing should be of a uniform style to avoid an stigmatisation.

#### **2. Type, Mix and design of housing**

Members were in agreement with:

**2.3** With this objective in mind, in the case of larger housing developments (10 plus houses in Shrewsbury, the market towns and other key centres and 5 plus houses in rural areas), the Council will generally seek to achieve a suitable mix of types and sizes of dwellings in the development. In particular it is normally important to include an adequate proportion of smaller dwellings as part of a development, particularly in rural areas where market forces tend to lead to the provision of larger dwellings at the expense of smaller dwellings. If this trend is unchecked it leads to the exclusion of less well-off people from rural villages and the countryside.

**And Mix, type and layout of the affordable housing requirement; Section 106 agreement Head of Terms**

**5. Affordable Homes for local people: exception sites especially:**

**Scale and design**

**5.21** Exception site developments must have regard to housing need and are relatively small sites. The scale of any individual scheme must reflect the character and scale of the settlement.

**Prioritising local people  
Definition of "local area"**

**Standard conditions regarding design requirements especially:**

**5.61** Permitted development rights of the affordable dwellings will normally be removed in order to retain control over future extensions. Applications for extensions and adaptations will be considered on their merits, including the personal circumstances of the applicant such as the needs of an occupant with disabilities or to accommodate appropriate extensions for family growth.

**And Rural Occupation Restrictions**

**(b) However, point 4.3 raised concern** because in making an explicit written statement Shropshire Council seems to weaken its position to ensure that developments meet the needs of the local population in terms of elements that might not be attractive to developer.

**4.30** Where a development can demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Housing Enabling officer that it is not viable at the level of contribution required, negotiations will determine what would be a viable contribution. An open book accounting approach will be used to assess the financial aspects of the development. This is an arrangement involving the structured management and sharing of costing information between client, contractor, associated suppliers and the Council. The template used by the Council is available at Appendix C.

**Members acknowledge** that economic considerations are important to enable the developers to undertake a project, but **4.30** seems to suggest that many of the social and economic considerations that are paramount to the community within which the development will be built can be swept aside in favour of the considerations of the developer.

**(c)** Members understand that the SPD will be reviewed annually as part of a monitoring report, and the first statutory report falling due in Dec 2011. Members support the existence and continuation of an annual review process.

**(d)** Members understand that the Dynamic Viability Index will be used to review the percentage of affordable housing required for each planning application.

Members understand that the current level is set at 13% with a financial contribution from developments of 1 – 5 houses and construction of affordable dwellings for developments above 5 houses.

Members support the proposal that the affordable housing monies will be ring-fenced. Members also support a further proposal that developments not able to meet the 13% affordable housing allocation will be refused.

(e) Members would like to see the percentage of affordable houses required within each development to increase and not decrease during the annual review process.

**(b) Trees At Ludlow Hospital**

**RESOLVED JS/LC (unanimous)**

To concur with tree wardens recommendations as follows:

There are three distinct areas of the site - the two car parks and the garden area to the rear of the older building which houses the maternity unit. Taking them in turn -

**The front car park** (off Gravel Hill). The two most prominent trees on the site are in this car park, both yews in early maturity. (Photos 1 and 2) One is located just inside the gate and the other prominently in the centre of the car park providing an attractive feature. Yews are long-lived trees which provide year-round greenery and withstand a good deal of abuse. It would be desirable for any redevelopment of the site to retain these two trees although the feature tree is likely to require careful design to incorporate into the site layout. As a precaution, requiring any developer at least to discuss plans for the trees with the County, these two trees warrant a Tree Preservation Order.

**The Rear Car park** (off New road). This area is characterised by lines of planted trees, mostly birch. One line is along the Western boundary and the other along the top of the bank overlooking the car park (photos 3 and 4). If existing site levels are to be retained it should be possible to keep both lines of trees. If the site is to be graded and the bank removed then only the line on the boundary could be retained. This would be desirable as the trees screen existing housing from the hospital site. However, the birch do not have any great individual merit and birch is a short-lived species. I do not believe that these trees warrant special protection.

**The Garden area.** There are numerous deciduous and coniferous trees and large shrubs in this area (photo 5), most of them planted but some self-seeded. There is a row of miscellaneous trees along the boundary and one good specimen maple in the South western corner (species unidentified - photo 6). It is highly unlikely that viable redevelopment of the site can retain many of these trees (unless they be incorporated into generous back gardens) but priority should be given to retaining selected trees along the boundary for screening of the new development. The specimen maple warrants protection by a Tree Preservation Order requiring the developer to discuss plans for the trees on the site with the County.

*Peter Norman Dip. Arb. (RFS)*

**(c) Severn Hospice**

**RESOLVED JW/JA (unanimous)**

To award a grant for £200

**(d) Ludlow Conservation Area Advisory Committee**  
**RESOLVED SMc/LC (unanimous)**

To nominate Jim Smithers for one of the vacant posts on the Committee.

**(e) Further Waiting Restriction Proposals in the Ludlow Area**  
**RESOLVED PH/JW (unanimous)**

To approve the proposals 1a – 5a and propose amendments to 6a (Appendix A) increase the yellow lines into Whitefriars and along Sandpits road as indicated in red, and a further section of yellow lines on the blind right hand bend further along Sandpits Road in the direction of Henley Road.

**(f) Temporary Parking Restrictions**  
**RESOLVED JW/JS (unanimous)**

To note the parking restrictions – Dinham, Ludlow (Sections of parking areas outside 1 to 8 Dinham, 11 to 15 Dinham) from 21 February 2011 – 4 weeks

**(g) Diversion Signage**  
**RESOLVED JS/JW (unanimous)**

To note information provided by Councillor Rosanna Taylor-Smith and agree that regular checks of the diversion signage is necessary. .

The meeting closed at **20:30pm**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Chairman

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

NB: No confidential minutes will be issued



**APPENDIX A**

